



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/563,717	01/06/2006	Stefan Muller	PD030074	1519
24498	7590	10/18/2007	EXAMINER	
JOSEPH J. LAKS, VICE PRESIDENT THOMSON LICENSING LLC PATENT OPERATIONS PO BOX 5312 PRINCETON, NJ 08543-5312			ALPHONSE, FRITZ	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2112		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		10/18/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/563,717	MULLER ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Fritz Alphonse	2112

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 January 2006.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-8 and 10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-8 and 10 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 9 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 06 January 2006 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                         |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/06/2006</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This Office Action is in regard to the application filed on 1/06/2006. Claims 1-10 are pending; claims 1, 8 and 10 are independent.

### ***Priority***

2. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

3. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 1/06/2006 has been considered by the examiner.

### ***Specification***

4. **Abstract Objection:** The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it is a duplication of claim 1 and it is not in narrative form. Also the abstract does not describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist in understanding the invention. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).
5. Applicant is reminded of the proper content of an abstract of the disclosure.

A patent abstract is a concise statement of the technical disclosure of the patent and should include that which is new in the art to which the invention pertains. If the patent is of a basic nature, the entire technical disclosure may be new in the art, and the abstract should be directed to the entire disclosure. If the patent is in the nature of an improvement in an old apparatus, process, product, or composition, the abstract should include the technical disclosure of the improvement. In certain patents, particularly those for compounds and compositions, wherein the process for making and/or the use thereof are not obvious, the abstract should set forth a process for making and/or use thereof. If the new technical disclosure involves modifications or alternatives, the abstract should mention by way of example the preferred modification or alternative.

The abstract should not refer to purported merits or speculative applications of the invention and should not compare the invention with the prior art.

Where applicable, the abstract should include the following:

- (1) if a machine or apparatus, its organization and operation;
- (2) if an article, its method of making;
- (3) if a chemical compound, its identity and use;
- (4) if a mixture, its ingredients;
- (5) if a process, the steps.

Extensive mechanical and design details of apparatus should not be given.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Particularly, as to claim 10, it is not clear to what it is meant by "apparatus for reading from and/ or writing to recording media..." The word "apparatus" is not clearly defined in the claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1-8, 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Demura (US Pub. No. 20020099996) in view of Greenblat (US Pub. No. 20030212830).

As to claim 8, Demura (figs. 1-12) show a device for error correction of an encoded data stream, including: an input buffer (figure 3, component 2) for saving the demodulated data stream and performing a first correction process on-the-fly (paragraph [0031]); an external DRAM to which the data are transferred after correction (paragraph [0044]); an embedded SRAM (figure 5 component 13) for performing a multipass correction on the corrected data;

Demura does not explicitly disclose “means for copying the data frame from the external DRAM to the embedded SRAM; and means for copying the corrected data back from the embedded SRAM to the external DRAM after the multipass correction.”

However, the limitations are obvious and well known in the art, as evidenced by Greenblat (paragraph [0413]). Greenblat teaches means for copying the data frame from the external DRAM to the embedded SRAM; and means for copying the corrected data back from the embedded SRAM to the external DRAM after the multipass correction.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to improve upon the communication system, as disclosed by Greenblat. Doing so would provide a highly robust programmable packet processor that can support a variety of high end applications, that is capable of handling a variety of protocols, and that provides desired performance in terms of speed and power.

As to claim 1, Demura (figs. 1-12) show a method for error correction of an encoded data stream including the steps of: saving the demodulated data stream in an input buffer (figure 3, component 2 shows an input buffer for saving the demodulated data stream) performing a first correction process on-the-fly in the input buffer (paragraph [0031]); transferring the data to an external DRAM after correction (paragraph [0044]).

Demura does not explicitly disclose “copying the data from the external DRAM to an embedded SRAM; starting a multipass correction in the embedded SRAM; and copying the corrected data back from the embedded SRAM to the external DRAM after the multipass correction.”

However, the limitations are obvious and well known in the art, as evidenced by Greenblat (paragraph [0413]). Greenblat teaches means for copying the data frame from the external DRAM to the embedded SRAM; and means for copying the corrected data back from the embedded SRAM to the external DRAM after the multipass correction.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to improve upon the communication system, as disclosed by Greenblat. Doing so would provide a highly robust programmable packet processor that can support a variety of high end applications, that is capable of handling a variety of protocols, and that provides desired performance in terms of speed and power.

As to claims 2-7, the dependent claims 2-7 included in the statement of rejection but not specifically addressed in the body of the rejection have inherited the deficiencies of the parent claim 1 and have not resolved the deficiencies. Therefore, they are rejected based on the same rationale as applied to the parent claim above.

As to claim 10, the claim has substantially the limitations of claim 1; therefore, they are analyzed as previously discussed in claim 1 above.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

10. Claim 9 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 9 contains allowable subject matter because none of the cited references either singular or in combination discloses “a device including a deinterleaver for deinterleaving and/or for correcting streaming discontinuities in the external DRAM.”

***Conclusion***

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO-892.

12. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231

**or faxed to:** (703) 872-9306 for all formal communications.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Fritz Alphonse, whose telephone number is (571) 272-3813. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:30-6:00, Alt. Mondays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jacques Louis-Jacques, can be reached at (571) 272-6962.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-3824

Information regarding the status of an application may also be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

Art Unit: 2112

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Fritz Alphonse

Art Unit 2112

October 10, 2007